

**AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWING(S)**

Figure 6C has been amended. New Figure 3C has been added. The attached Replacement Sheets 3 and 6 of formal drawings replace the original sheets 3 and 6.

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants respond herein to the Office Action mailed January 30, 2007.

Claims 1-22 and 25-29 are pending in the Application. Claims 1-23 and 26-29 were rejected in the Office Action. Claims 24 and 25 were indicated as allowable. Applicants thank the Examiner for this early indication of the allowable subject matter.

#### ***Response to Drawings Objections***

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner because the subject matter of Claims 4 and 5 was not shown in the drawings. Applicants added new Figure 3C, which shows the view previously depicted in Figure 3B with an added reference numerals R1 and R2 corresponding to the radius of the annular pinching edges 40 and the radius of the cylindrical rotor 8, respectively. Further, Applicants amended Figure 6C to more particularly show that the pinching edges of the movable blades are positioned more proximate to the pinching edges of the stationary blades than the planar regions of the same blades. Applicants amended the specification to reflect the revised drawings. No new matter has been added.

#### ***Response to Claim Objections***

Claim 4 was objected to by the Examiner because the Examiner believes that it is unclear “how the pinching edges can have a radius.” As shown in the original Figures 3A and 3B and the new Figure 3C, edges 40 of the movable blades 11 and the stationary blades 12 have an arcuate shape. Further, radius R1 which is the radius of the pinching edges 40 is equal to the radius R2 which is the radius of the cylindrical rotor 8. Both radii are measured from the center of the cylindrical rotor 8. Accordingly, Applicants believe that Claim 4, as amended, is clear in view of the specification and the drawings.

Claim 5 was objected to by the Examiner because the Examiner believes that it is unclear what is meant by the pinching edges being proximate more to each other than the planar facing regions. Applicants amended Claim 5 to more clearly recite the feature of the present application disclosing that, as shown in the revised Figure 6C, the pinching edges of movable blades 11 and stationary blades 12 are more proximate to each other than the planar portions of the same blades. Thus, as shown in Figure 6C, the distance M, i.e., the distance between the pinching edges 40 of the movable blade 11 and the stationary blade 12, is smaller than the distance N, i.e., the distance between the planar portions of the same blades.

Claims 9, 21 and 25 were also objected to by the Examiner due to several informalities. Applicants amended Claims 9, 21 and 25 to correct the informalities. Further, to eliminate any

inconsistency, Claim 27 was amended to recite “stub ends to capture said shaft” instead of the “means for to capture said shaft.”

***Response to Claim Rejections***


Applicants accepted the Examiner’s suggestion with respect to the allowable Claim 24 and amended Claim 1 to include all limitations of Claims 24 and 23 (Claim 24 depended on Claim 23, which in turn depended on Claim 1). Independent Claim 28 was amended in a similar fashion. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 28 are now allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 2-22, 25-27 and 29 depend directly or indirectly from Claims 1 and 28. Therefore, Claims 2-22, 25-27 and 29 are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1 and 28 and, further, on their own merits.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-22 and 25-29 is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First-Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 30, 2007:

Robert C. Faber

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative




Signature

May 30, 2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber

Registration No.: 24,322

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF/AV:db